THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

16 October 1986

AM 10:00 CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of 18 September 1986 minutes.

B. Dates of next meetings:

20 November 1986, 10:00 AM (Thursday)

18 December 1986, 10:00 AM (Thursday)

C. PortAmerica: Report on statement presented to the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works by J. Carter Brown, Chairman, on 1 October 1986.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. District of Columbia, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 86-148, Fifth and H Streets, N. W. Gateway proposed by the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association.

b. S.L. 87-07, 441 4th Street, N. W., Judiciary Square. Confirmation of working drawings for new office building. (Previous S.L. 86-76)

c. Appendix I.

2. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 86-247, 3240 Reservoir Street, N. W. Proposed changes to approved concept plans for new residential building. (Approval, O.G. 85-70)

b. O.G. 86-250, 2900 M Street, N. W. Window and door alterations.

c. O.G. 86-251, 3240 "O" Street, N. W., St. John's Church. Handicapped ramp and access door.

d. Appendix II.

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 86-152	601 Indiana Avenue, N. W. Charles Gueli	Sidewalk cafe furnishings

ACTION: Existing sidewalk cafe constructed without CFA approval. Request submission of drawings and material samples for review.

S.L. 86-160	500 H Street, N. W. Comfort Inn	Sign

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for two, internally-illuminated, white plastic signs as shown on drawing received and dated 24 September 1986.

S.L. 86-161	1426 H Street, N. W. S. J. G. Properties, Inc.	Raze building

ACTION: Void. Razing applications are not within the jurisdiction of the Commission of Fine Arts in the Shipstead-Luce areas.

S.L. 86-163	700 Water Street, S. W. Barley Mow	Sign

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed internally-illuminated sign having red plexiglas eight-inch letters as indicated on submitted materials received and dated 8 October 1986.

S.L. 87-01	500 H Street, N. W. Comfort Inn	Canopies

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed canopies shown in drawing received and dated 6 October 1986.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 87-02	133 C Street, N. W. Youth With A Mission	Alterations and renovation

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit. No objection to proposed interior work or exterior alterations to rear two-story addition. Recommend against replacing original two-over-two front windows with thermopane units having six-over-six plug-ins which would be inappropriate. Two-over-two, double-glazed, double-hung windows can be manufactured with permanent muntins. Addition of proposed shutters and first floor balcony are inappropriate. If original hardware exists on building for shutter installation, shutters can be considered. Surfacing the front yard in brick is inappropriate. Recommend replacing with landscaping.

S.L. 87-03	2910 Cortland Place, N. W. Richard Moran	Exterior renovation

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed renovation work shown in drawings received and dated 3 October 1986.

S.L. 87-04	144 D Street, S. E. Mark Powden	Renovation and alteration

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for renovation work as shown on drawing received and dated 6 October 1986. (See previous submission: S.L. 86-149.)

S.L. 87-05	400 New Jersey Avenue, N. W. Hyatt Regency	Revision to pool

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for revision to previously approved design (see S.L. 86-79) for new pool structure as shown in drawings received and dated 6 October 1986.

S.L. 86-110	1801 Quincy Street, N. W. Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Taylor	Additions

ACTION: Void. Submission withdrawn by request of owner.

OLD GEORGETOWN ACT SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-242	3520 Reservoir Road, N. W. Steven Brown	New single family residence

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for construction of proposed single family dwelling as shown in drawings received and dated 11 September 1986. A letter from the architect dated 10 October certifies that the working drawings concur with the previously approved concept design (O.G. 86-153). A brick and mortar sample panel shall be erected on site for inspection and approval of Commission of Fine Arts.

O.G. 86-243	3524 Reservoir Road, N. W. Scott Stinson	New single family residence

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for construction of proposed single family dwelling as shown in drawings received and dated 11 September 1986. A letter from the architect dated 10 October certifies that the working drawings concur with the previously approved concept design (O.G. 86-154). A brick and mortar sample panel shall be erected on site for inspection and approval of Commission of Fine Arts.

O.G. 86-237	1554 35th Street, N. W. Georgetown Visitation	Renovation and alterations

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed renovation and alterations to existing building as shown in drawings received and dated 4 September 1986. A letter from the architect dated 23 September lists three items which differ from the previously approved concept (O.G. 86-208). These changes are acceptable.

O.G. 86-246	3308 Reservoir Road, N. W. Rawlings residence	Deck, porch and stoop

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed renovation work including a new entrance stoop and planter, and rear deck and ground floor infill as shown on drawings and supplemental sheet, received and dated 16 September 1986 and 25 September respectively.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-232	3209 O Street, N. W. Sharon Glickman	Awning/sign

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit. An awning at this location is superfluous and a detriment to the architectural integrity of the existing building. Recommend study of some other means of identification.

O.G. 86-234	1517 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Matin, Inc.	Awnings/sign

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed awnings and lettering shown on drawing received and dated 28 August 1986, provided that awnings are modified to have valances. Lettering must be applied to vertical valance surfaces only.

O.G. 86-230	3106 M Street, N. W. Earl Meyerson	Existing sign

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit. Existing sign which wraps around building surfaces, obscuring architectural elements, is not appropriate. Recommend more discreet sign, with individual letters painted in white on the glass (as an example).

O.G. 86-239	1634 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Nam Won Peek	Sign

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed sign as shown on drawing received and dated 11 September 1986, provided that logo colors be omitted from "Q." Sign will not have internal illumination.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

16 October 1986

The meeting was convened at 10:00 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Members present:	Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman Hon. Carolyn J. Deaver Hon. Roy M. Goodman Hon. Frederick E. Hart Hon. Neil H. Porterfield Hon. Diane Wolf
Staff present:	Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson Mrs. Sue A. Kohler
National Capital Planning Commission staff present:	Mr. Robert Cousins

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of 18 September 1986 minutes. Miss Wolf requested that changes be made to the minutes of the meeting; specifically, revisions to her comments regarding a site inspection at 1024 Wisconsin Avenue (O.G. 86-193 and 194), and the addition of her comments regarding the dormer windows on the addition to the Corcoran Gallery (S.L. 86-154). These changes, as submitted in typewritten form, will be inserted in the September minutes, following pages 8 and 13.

Miss Wolf also requested that if the stenotypist had difficulty hearing any of the comments made, she should ask the speaker to repeat them, and not enter the word "inaudible" into the transcript.

B. Dates of next meetings, approved as: 20 November 1986 (Thursday)
18 December 1986 (Thursday)

C. PortAmerica: Report on statement presented to the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works by J. Carter Brown, Chairman, on 1 October 1986. The Chairman reviewed the statements made at the hearing, particularly that of Representative Hoyer, who strongly defended the right of Prince George's County to build the tower with no changes and engaged in a dialogue with Senator Cranston on high-rise buildings in San Francisco. The Chairman said it was sad to see the polarization that had developed over the issue of Prince George's prestige. He said the statements of the developer and the architect, in contrast, had been very low-key, with their main points being that the tower would be visible only as a small object in the distance and that there was no intention of competing with the Nation's primary symbols. He described their visual material, noting that such evidence can be deceptive. Of the government witnesses, he said Architect of the Capitol George White had come out very firmly against the tower, as had the private sector, including the National Trust. The Secretary noted that the government's position had been somewhat weakened by the inability of the other agencies involved to decide which one would be the lead agency. The Chairman said he had supplemented the prepared statement with additional comments, recalling that he had used a map to point out that if a compass rather than a T square had been used to define the District boundaries, with the compass swung out from the Washington Monument, the Prince George's site would be within the boundaries; now, it is actually closer to the Monument than some parts of the District. He said his remarks would be sent to the members when the transcript was available.

Mr. Hart asked what the status of the project was at this time, and the Secretary said permits were still needed from the FAA, FHA, and the Park Service. Mr. Hart asked if there was anything else the Commission could do, and the Chairman said he did not think there was, for the moment, but that he hoped there could eventually be legislation on the whole problem, not just this building; he said, however, that Senator Moynihan had indicated that no legislation could be expected from this session of Congress. Exhibit A

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 86-148, Fifth and H Streets, N. W. Gateway proposed by the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association. The Assistant Secretary recalled that in May 1985 the Commission had approved a Chinese style arch

in Chinatown spanning H Street, N. W. at 7th Street. He noted that it was now nearly completed and said this submission was for a second arch, to be located two blocks to the east. He showed photographs of the first arch and of the site for the second, pointing out its proximity to the entrance of a new hotel, the Comfort Inn, which had been approved by the Commission. He said a letter had been received from Old Saint Mary's Church, located nearby, in which objections were raised as to the propriety of placing the arch in this location. He introduced the chairman of the sponsoring group, and the architect, Peter Liu.

Mr. Liu showed a rendering and said the arch would be similar in style to the first one erected--northern Chinese, Ching dynasty--and that plans for erecting it had been coordinated with the District government. He said the Benevolent Association had originally wanted to erect two arches, in a different Chinese style, but the city had gone ahead and accepted the first arch as a gift from the city of Beijing, and so they would erect a second arch in the Ching style. He said the roof would be slightly different and there would be lions at the foot of each supporting pier.

Senator Goodman asked about the city's position on the project, and the Secretary said that the arch had the city's support, as did its general location, but it was recognized that the neighbors did have problems with some aspects of it. Miss Wolf asked the representative from the Benevolent Society if Chinatown had grown recently; she was told that there had been slow growth, more rapid in the years since the opening of the Convention Center. In answer to her question about funding, he said it would be privately funded and maintained by the Benevolent Association.

Several people asked to comment. Father Petrini, from Old Saint Mary's Church, said the church's objection to the arch was that, in its proposed location, it would compete with the Victorian style of the church and other buildings in the surrounding neighborhood; he noted that the new Comfort Inn had been designed to be compatible with the Victorian style. He said he hoped the arch could be moved further east. Senator Goodman asked if the arch would be seen from the church; Father Petrini said it would.

Eric Colbert, architect of the Comfort Inn, spoke next. He said that in designing this building he had worked with Old Saint Mary's and studied the character of the neighborhood. He said he had not known about the proposed Chinese arch, and as planned, one of the supports would interfere with the front entrance canopy of the hotel; because of interior arrangements the entrance could not at this time be moved to Fifth Street. He said he thought the arch had to be dealt with as a sculptural element, and its strong stylistic statement also had to be considered. He suggested a location at Fourth and H Streets, or possibly Sixth and H, because of the existence of more open space. He said his clients had already had

considerable financial difficulties, and enduring eight months of construction for the arch just as the hotel was about to open would only make matters worse. Mr. Porterfield asked about the boundaries of Chinatown and was told they were at Fifth and Eighth Streets; however, Mr. Colbert pointed out that the first arch had been erected at Seventh, rather than Eighth Street, so he did not think there was a strong argument to have the second one at Fifth Street.

The members then looked at a large model and discussed possible locations. Jacques de Puy, attorney for the hotel, then outlined his client's position and asked that the Commission consider another location for the arch. The representative from the Benevolent Association said they had asked that the hotel be designed in a Chinese style, which would have been compatible with Chinatown, and he said he believed the hotel owners did know about the arch during the design process. Mr. Hart asked him when the Chinese community had come to this area and was told that it was during the 1930's.

Mr. Yung, representing the Chinese community, said he thought both arches were consistent with the aims of Title 97 of D. C. Law 576, passed in 1984, which were to protect and preserve the cultural aspects of Chinatown, and he said design criteria for the area were to be wide-ranging and include Chinese design features. He said a survey of the location of Chinese people had been made when the Convention Center was built, and it had been found that they were scattered throughout the area; he said he thought they would tend to move east of the present boundaries in the future. Mr. Hart and Miss Wolf asked Mr. Yung if he was for the arch in its present location, and he said he was, adding that he thought Fourth Street was too far east.

Mr. Hart said that the problem was not with the design of the arch, but that there were definitely problems with the siting of the arch, and he thought it needed further study. He noted that the area had become Chinese only in the fairly recent past, and that there were other, older aspects of the neighborhood that could suffer from improper siting of this arch. Mr. Porterfield agreed, adding that whatever the exact location, it had to be decided whether present or projected future boundaries were going to be defined. Senator Goodman said no location should be considered if it would have a devastating effect on any building.

The Chairman observed that the two arches would be seen in a foreshortened perspective, and if the second arch were moved too far west, Chinatown would appear too small. He said he would have no problem with moving it eastward. He said the Commission could not decide the location, but realized that the arch could not be exactly where it was being proposed; he thought the interested parties should work together in solving this problem.

Miss Wolf asked how the other members felt, in general, about arches across the city's streets, in light of their effect on the L'Enfant plan, and she asked if more arches were likely to be proposed. The Chairman said such requests would have to be considered on a case-by-case basis, and it was unlikely this kind of request would come up again. He said he didn't think this case had anything to do with L'Enfant since it was not proposed for one of the special streets in the plan. Miss Wolf then asked if the bases of the supports for the arch were too large for the sidewalk; the consensus was that they were not.

There were no further questions, and while there were no objections to the erection of a second arch in the Chinese style, it was requested that the location be restudied and another submission made. Exhibit B

b. S.L. 87-07, 441 4th Street, N. W. Judiciary Square. Confirmation of working drawings for new office building. (Previous S.L. 86-76) Staff member Jeffrey Carson said this was a routine confirmation of working drawings, that the staff had checked the drawings and received a letter from the architect, Vlastimil Koubek, stating that they conformed to the approved concept design. Mr. Porterfield asked to see the site plan, noting that plans are bound to change somewhat. He looked at it and gave his approval. The Chairman commented that architects should not be overly assiduous in limiting themselves to approved concepts; he said the Commission would welcome improvements to any design. There were no objections to the final plans and they were unanimously approved. Exhibit B

c. Appendix I. Discussed at the end of the meeting.

2. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 86-247, 3240 Reservoir Street, N. W. Proposed changes to approved concept plans for new residential building. (Approval. O.G. 85-70) The Assistant Secretary recalled that the Commission had recently been concerned with the renovation of the old houses on this site, but was now being asked to consider revisions to an approved concept design for the new residential building. He said the Georgetown Board had reviewed the changes and was recommending approval of Scheme "A", while noting that the design still needed further refinement. He said the principal change had been the reduction of the unit from a multi-family condominium to a two-family dwelling, which was reflected in the design, giving the appearance of a pair of semi-detached houses. This change had made possible the elimination of a parking ramp between the old and new buildings, as well as a service area and garages in the rear. It would permit the retention of the existing masonry wall along the street between the old

building on the corner of Wisconsin Avenue and the new construction, thus concealing the abrupt drop in grade. Garages for each dwelling unit would be placed in the front. The Board noted that the new parking arrangement would make possible a tree canopy and gardens at the rear of the new construction.

The Assistant Secretary said that, in its review, the Commission should not approve any zoning exceptions on the site as the project had not yet been reviewed by the Zoning Commission. He said, however, that the staff had conferred with the Zoning Administrator, and after an informal look at the drawings, he did not anticipate any problems.

Architect William Cochran was then introduced. He showed two versions of the new design, Schemes A and B, pointing out changes in the roof line, windows and doors, and said the building would be 2 feet lower than before, and Scheme A would be slightly smaller in square footage than Scheme B. He said the change in design would make it possible to get rid of 1700 square feet of paving.

Mrs. Alicia Boyd, representing the Foundation for the Preservation of Historic Georgetown, then asked to comment. She noted first that this would be a condominium, not two single-family dwellings. Miss Wolf asked Mr. Policy, the attorney for the owners, to explain the term "condominium". He said it was simply a legal term for a certain kind of ownership, usually involving an agreement among the owners regarding maintenance of the property. He said in this case it was a two-family dwelling owned on a condominium basis. Mrs. Boyd pointed out that the kind of ownership could make a difference in the appearance of a building; for example, single-family dwellings required side yards and condominiums did not. She introduced Mr. Chiswell Langhorne, treasurer of the Foundation, and read a letter (which she had read at an earlier meeting) from Wynant Vanderpool, president of the Foundation, regarding the development of this property and the restoration of the old houses. She then reviewed the history of the project, the objections of the neighbors to the loss of open space, a petition against an earlier, larger proposal, and the question about which agency should review the restoration plans for the lower part of the rear of the old houses facing Wisconsin Avenue. She said that if the Commission was not required to review these plans because the work would not be visible from public space, then it must be reviewed by the D. C. Historic Preservation Board. She referred to a letter from the District government to the Commission, dated 3 September 1986, requesting information on what alterations had been reviewed.

Turning to the new construction, Mrs. Boyd showed a drawing of the street, done by a neighbor, to show the scale of the buildings. She said the new building would jut out too far into the street, but Mr. Cochran said it did not go beyond the property line, and in a case like this, where the houses were set with the diagonal of Wisconsin Avenue rather than the orthogonal alignment of Reservoir Street, there would always be

a certain amount of jutting, stepwise, in and out. Mrs. Boyd asked Mrs. Shannon to read the 1985 resolution by the ANC requesting that the new construction be compatible with the old in scale and size and leave adequate open space; she then read a recommendation by the Ward 3 citizens advisory committee on the size and character of commercial development on Wisconsin Avenue. She said she thought the new design for the residential building was an improvement, but she thought the Commission could speak to its height, and she thought there should be more dialogue between the Georgetown Board and the residents. She added that the D. C. Historic Preservation Review Board still had to consider the subdivision question.

Mr. Hart asked Mrs. Boyd if it would be accurate to say that she thought massing and open space were the main issues; she replied that that would be correct as far as the Foundation was concerned, but others might have different objections.

Mr. Policy asked to speak. He said the owners, Aramus Corporation, wanted to proceed with either the design approved previously or the new one presented at this meeting; he said they would not consent to further delay. He said they had worked with the Georgetown Board and the citizens over a long period of time and found that it was impossible to satisfy everyone. He said the important question was whether or not the Commission was satisfied.

Mrs. Deaver asked what the Board's position was, and the Chairman said they were recommending approval of Scheme A with some further refinements to be reviewed. He said he thought the design had been improved, and commended Mrs. Boyd on her role in helping bring about all the improvements since the original proposal; but he did not see how the Commission could turn down a building of only three storeys, smaller than one previously approved, on a street of houses built only in the 1930's and 1940's, and directly across the street from a large expanse of open space. Miss Wolf said she hoped that in the future the Commission would see that citizen participation in Georgetown was very important, and would realize that the Georgetown Board was only advisory to the Commission. She thought the Commission should consider what its role was in Georgetown--to act as a preservation agency or to guide development.

Mr. Hart made a motion that the matter before the Commission be brought to a vote; Senator Goodman seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the revised concept design, Scheme A, was approved, with Miss Wolf dissenting. Exhibit B

b. O.G. 86-250, 2900 M Street, N. W. Window and door alterations. Mr. Carson said the Board reviewed this project on the 4th and 30th of September and had approved the work with the exception of the treatment of the vestibule entrance; the proposed glass door had been disapproved and a gate suggested instead, as being more in keeping with the late Victorian style of the building. He said the applicant was appealing this decision

to the Commission, and introduced the son of the applicant, Pierre Gaunoux. Mr. Gaunoux said his father had owned the building since 1973 and that the vestibule had never had an outer door. Now, however, there was a problem with vagrants and trash, and they would like to be able to close it off at night. They liked the idea of a glass door because it would allow the attractive wood trim and stonework inside to be seen; he said they intended to keep a light on in the vestibule at night. He said his father had done a lot of work on the building, which will have an art gallery on the ground floor, and he thought an iron gate would close in the vestibule and detract from the appearance of the building.

The Chairman thought that the glass would connote an entirely different historical aesthetic, and would probably pick up reflections and be something of an intrusion rather than receding. He suggested putting the glass behind decorative ironwork as was often done in the past, although he said he realized it would be more expensive. Mr. Gaunoux agreed that it would, and added that it would also be difficult to find someone to do it. The Chairman thought that might have been true several years ago, but he said now there was a revival of interest in the Victorian period and people were doing this sort of thing. Mr. Hart agreed and said he knew there were a number of craftsmen working in iron. Mr. Gaunoux said he and his father were strong supporters of preservation, did not want to argue with the Commission, and would see what could be done.

The Chairman commended the owners on his care for this particularly charming building, and suggested that he work with the staff on the design.

Exhibit B

c. O.G. 86-251, 3240 "O" Street, N. W., St. John's Church. Handicapped ramp and access door. Mr. Carson reviewed the history of the buildings on the site, saying that the church had been built in 1806, although it had been remodeled several times, the parish hall in the 1860's, and the rectory in 1875. He noted that there had been a complete remodeling of the parish hall in 1929, when a second story was added and the design of the front changed. Mrs. Kohler said it was probably at this time that the entrance door took the form it has now. Mr. Carson showed photographs, pointing out the steep steps leading to the parish hall and church entrance and said the proposal was to put a ramp in front of the rectory, screen it with planting, and change the double door of the parish hall entrance to a single door to allow wheelchair entrance. He said the Georgetown Board had found the approach sensitive, but did not approve of the addition of sidelights to the entrance opening to make up for the narrower single door. Panels had been suggested instead. The architect, Istvan Peteronecz, was then introduced. He showed his drawing of the new door with side lights and said the church was concerned that if panels were substituted there would not be enough light in the hall. The Chairman agreed with the Georgetown Board that the side lights made the door look too Georgian and not in character with the more simple

design of the church; on the other hand, as light was a problem and the door was almost certainly 20th century, he thought Mr. Peteronecz' design could be accepted. Mr. Carson said the Board had not been aware of the probability that the door was recent when they made their recommendation.

Mr. Hart said that while he realized the necessity for the ramp, he felt there was not much that could be done to make it attractive, so the type and placement of landscaping material would be very important. The other members agreed, and Mr. Petronecz said it was his intention to pay particular attention to this aspect of the project. The ramp and access door were then approved, with the stipulation that the Commission see a landscape plan. Exhibit B

d. Appendix II. See below.

The members then turned to a discussion of the Shipstead and Georgetown appendices:

II. A. 1. d. Appendix I. Miss Wolf asked for an explanation of item S.L. 86-152. The Secretary told her that, as the action stated, the sidewalk cafe was built without Commission approval, and a full submission was being requested. He said the Commission had seen only a concept plan for that side of the block, and what was done for the cafe would set the tone for the whole streetfront. Miss Wolf also questioned what was meant by "exterior renovation" in S.L. 87-03 and asked to see the drawings. Mr. Carson showed them to her, explained the nature of the renovation and said the primary change was to the rear and side windows. Neither Miss Wolf nor the other members had further questions, and Appendix I was unanimously approved.

II. A. 2. d. Appendix II. Miss Wolf said she had a problem with the wording on the actions, when "No objection to issuance of permit" was followed by a request for modifications. She said she did not understand how the Commission could be sure its recommendations were met before the permit was issued. Mr. Carson explained the process to her, and William Cochran, architect for one of the projects on the Appendix, told her the Commission's action was typed right on the permit, making it a condition for the permit. Miss Wolf then asked about references to on-site inspections of brick panels. She asked who made the inspections and was told they were made by the staff. She asked that she be advised when the inspections were to take place so that she could be present. The Secretary said he would keep her informed.

There were no further questions and Appendix II was unanimously approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

EXHIBIT A

STATEMENT OF J. CARTER BROWN

BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON

ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

OCTOBER 1, 1986

STATEMENT OF J. CARTER BROWN BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS REGARDING THE PORTAMERICA PROPOSAL, OCTOBER 1, 1986

Mr. Chairman:

I appreciate the opportunity to express once again the Commission's concerns about the PortAmerica project. The Senate District Subcommittee asked us for a report on the subject in April, and I am happy to give you a copy to include in the record of these proceedings. Our concern today is unchanged. The height of the office tower for PortAmerica is too high for the Washington skyline. Mr. Lewis is now proposing a building with fewer stories than his original design, so that we are talking about a height of 730' over the river rather than 840'. Even at this reduced height, the Commission feels that the preeminence of the Washington Monument as our dominant symbol on the Capital's skyline will be irreparably damaged. That is really the issue. It is not only a question of the view from various spots in Washington, such as atop the Monument or from the balcony overlooking the south lawn of the White House and how the tower would intrude on these views. More important, is the presence of this tower as it will be seen and felt on a regional basis. No longer will the Washington Monument and the Capitol be the dominant visual and symbolic elements in the National Capital area.

The vantage points where this difference will be perceived are many: from the central core of Washington, to some degree. But the real impact will be felt from the highways approaching and encircling the Capital, especially those from the south near the PortAmerica site. Certainly the effect on the view from the Beltway and across the Potomac River from the Woodrow Wilson Bridge will be enormous.

There is no question that if this building is built at its currently proposed height of seven hundred plus feet, a special quality unique to Washington will be lost once and for all. Washington's skyline stands today with its great symbols of government undiminished by competing structures. I would hate to see us lose this precious quality, yet it is inevitable if buildings like PortAmerica's tower are allowed. Once the door is opened, others will follow, and the efforts to preserve the unique qualities of Washington attained through the historic and wise restraints enacted by the Congress in 1910 and exercised over building heights in this city ever since will be for naught.

EXHIBIT B

AGENDA ITEM EXHIBITS
CFA Meeting 16 October 1986
Shipstead-Luce and Old Georgetown Actions

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 86-148	Fifth and H Streets, N. W. Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association	Chinese Gate

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit for proposed gateway. Location would block entrance to new hotel building at 500 H Street, N. W. No objection to design of gateway or erection over public space provided that the applicants and the District of Columbia Planning Office find a mutually suitable location and alignment on H Street, N. W.

S.L. 86-162	1426 H Street, N. W. S.J.G. Properties	New office building

ACTION: Withdrawn by written request of applicant.

S.L. 86-07	441 4th Street, N. W. Peter N. G. Schwartz Co.	New office building

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for new office building. Working drawings conform to approved concept plans, (S.L. 86-76). Exterior materials shall match corresponding building across Judiciary Square at 400 block, 5th Street, N. W.

O.G. 86-247	3240 Reservoir Street, N. W. Aramus Corporation	New townhouses

ACTION: No objection to concept of two townhouses subject to the following conditions: there shall be no zoning exceptions required; scheme "A" shall be further developed and refined to focus the present emphasis from the recessed garage bays to the stoops and entrances; design development drawings will be presented for Georgetown Board review and approval; working drawings shall be submitted for review and approval of the Commission of Fine Arts prior to permit issuance; and an on site brick and mortar sample shall be erected for Commission approval prior to erection of exterior walls.

---

16 October 1986
Agenda Item Exhibits

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-250	2900 M Street, N. W. Pierre Ganoux	Window and door alterations

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for sash replacement only. Recommend additional study of proposed tower entrance door, specifically a cpmbination of glass and ornamental metal in character with building.

O.G. 86-251	3240 O Street, N. W. St. John's Church	Handicapped ramp

ACTION: No objection to concept designs for handicapped ramp. Submit working drawings and landscape plans with plant schedules for review and approval of Commission of Fine Arts prior to issuance of permit. No objection to proposed doorway alteration with glass sidelights.

MEETING:

20 November 1986